In the Specification

Please amended page 4, lines 1-4 as follows:

-- [[Fig. 8]] Figs. 8A-8D [[contains]] contain graphs that illustrate aspects of adaptive delivery of VBR/CBR MPEG I bitstreams.

[[Fig. 9]] Figs. 9A-B [[contains]] contain graphs that illustrate aspects of bandwidth versus frame types, in accordance with an example that is given in the text.--

Please amend page 29, line 10 through page 30, line 5 as follows:

--Experimental Results

We tested the implementation using both CBR and VBR bitstreams. Figs. 8A-D and 9A-B show some of these results. The 3Mbps VBR MPEG I bitstream is 320x240x30 fps and is two-pass-coded with minimal bitrate at 1Mbps and maximal bitrate at 4Mbps. Its GOP structure is 1I5P3B. The 1.2Mbps CBR bitstream is 320x240x29.97 fps and is one pass coded. Its GOP structure is 1I3P3B.

[[Fig. 8]] Figs. 8A-D [[shows]] show delivered frame sizes of the first 200 frames of these two clips at different bandwidths. The curves show the average frames size over a window of 60 frames. One can clearly see which frames are escape-coded during the adaptive delivery process. The delivery bitrate of the 3Mbps VBR bitstream is also smoothed because we assumed fixed delivery bandwidth. [[Fig. 9]] Figs. 9A-B [[shows]]

show how the statistics of frame types change when the delivery bandwidth changes.

From these results one can see that bandwidths of the delivered streams are successfully reduced and smoothed. Thus, playback of these video bitstreams is possible even when the network bandwidth is far narrower than that the source bitstreams demand and when the client side buffer size is limited. From [[Fig. 9]] Figs. 9A-B one can see that frame data are preserved in the order of importance as preferred. This simple adaptation scheme can have its limitation too. For example, the frame rates of adaptation results are still not ideally adjusted because the structures of the MPEG I video sequence are fixed and the QoS factor definition is not optimal.--